UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

| United States of America, | Case No. CR 18-0390 VC |
|---|--|
| Plaintiff, v. Gregory Jamus Chrisman Defendant. Plaintiff, Defendant. | STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT 2018 the Court excludes time refer the |
| For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{8/28}{9/25}$, 2018, the Court excludes time enter the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{8/28}{28}$, 2018 to $\frac{9/25}{29}$, 2018 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s): | |
| Failure to grant a continuance would be line See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). | kely to result in a miscarriage of justice. |
| defendants, the nature of the prosect or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ad | to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact lequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). |
| | the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, igence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). |
| Failure to grant a continuance would unrecounsel's other scheduled case commitme See. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | asonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ents, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. |
| Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | |
| IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 8 18 18 | JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge |
| STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant | Assistant United States Attorney |
| • | |